



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

faith in God, his emphasis upon love, and his insistence upon inwardness in religion are all thought to be worthy of emulation.

Juster, "avocat à la cour d'appel" in Paris, goes very thoroughly into the subject of the legal, economic, and social status of the Jews within the Roman Empire. His work opens with a 180-page study of the sources—literary, monumental, and juridical. A section on the Diaspora names, with detailed citation of authorities, the various places where the presence of Jews is mentioned. The number in the empire before the war of 70 A.D. is estimated to have been between six and seven million. Following these introductory matters is first a short chapter on the privileges of the Jews and then a long discussion of the Jewish cult—its political status, the gathering of proselytes, the relation to Christians, and the protection which the Jewish religion was granted. Chap. iii deals with the general organization of Jews within the empire and chap. iv with the local organization. Then come several brief chapters including the civic status, private statute, marriage, divorce, "capacité de fait," contracts, property laws, slaves, wills, and inheritance laws. The subject of Jewish jurisdiction is investigated at much greater length. The work closes with brief chapters on costume, name, tribes (in the Roman sense), public entertainments, right of suffrage, public charges, and economic situation. Such, in brief, is the ground covered. The author's method is that of the statistician, consequently he has produced a work of reference rather than one for popular reading. A prodigious amount of information is packed in the numerous footnotes, which on an average occupy at least three-quarters of every page. This feature alone would make the volumes indispensable to every student of the imperial period, whether interested primarily in Judaism or in Christianity or in the general history of the time. But the absence of an index is an unpardonable defect, notwithstanding the lengthy analytical table of contents.

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

Haupt's important contribution to the study of synoptic origins<sup>1</sup> gives evidence of most painstaking detailed examination of the entire text of the first three gospels. To test its conclusions effectively would

<sup>1</sup> *Worte Jesu und Gemeindeüberlieferung. Eine Untersuchung zur Quellengeschichte der Synopse.* (Windisch's *Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament.* Heft 3.) Von Walther Haupt. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913. 263 pages. M. 7. 50.

require a discussion of nearly the same length. But from its closely written pages, where no word is superfluous, emerges the following general picture of the successive steps in the first-century literary process which produced our Synoptics.

1. A written sketch of Jerusalem-memories, covering the last two days of Jesus' career.

2. A similar sketch of Galilean-memories, covering the period from John the Baptist's appearance to Jesus' prediction of his passion and his departure for the last Passover.

3. The earliest complete narrative, made by putting 1 and 2 together, the passion predictions being the connecting link. This is narrative, without discourse material, and is the source of all later narratives. It existed in many recensions, and suffered many changes and additions. Like 1 and 2, it originated in Palestine, and before the middle of the first century.

4. The *Grundbericht* (G) or source-narrative embodied in Mark and used later by his fellow-synoptists. This narrative is still without discourse, and develops on the basis of the *Stammberecht* (3), but is no longer an objective rendering of tradition. It is dominated throughout by the concern to demonstrate Jesus' messiahship. "History is thus corrected by dogmatics"; new material is added, especially the miracles, and the old material is enlarged and reshaped so as most effectively to serve the messianic interest. This document is produced in the Jerusalem community about the year 50; there and then was it most important to prove to unbelieving Judaism that "God had made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified."

5. The first discourse-group (Q<sup>1</sup>), consisting primarily of an eschatological discourse to the disciples concerning their apostolic future (substance in Matt., chap. 10), with a further discourse on rank in the kingdom, illustrated by the little child; probably also the parable of the Sower. This document is based on traditional words of Jesus, but in this form is the product of the community. It is written to supplement G, to which it is now added, in the early fifties. Jerusalem is again its place of origin. With it Paul is familiar, as is clear from I Thess., chaps. 4 and 5, and I Cor., chap. 9. Its standpoint is that of strict Jewish Christianity; it forbids (Matt. 10:5 f.) the Gentile mission for those to whom it is addressed, even if not anti-Pauline in fuller sense.

6. A second addition to G (Q<sup>2</sup>), consisting of a series of seventeen conflicts between Jesus and the Pharisees, with a brief discourse dealing also with questions of the Law. The latter is added to Q<sup>1</sup>, the former

to G, which, however, now form one document. The standpoint of Q<sup>2</sup> is less strictly Jewish than that of Q<sup>1</sup>; it begins already to exercise some criticism on the traditional usages and convictions, and to develop independent moral and religious consciousness. This second addition to G is made also in Jerusalem, about 55, and is known to Paul (I Cor., chap. 7). G, Q<sup>1</sup>, and Q<sup>2</sup>, may exist in the year 55 in three separate parchment rolls, but are regarded as one collection of "memorabilia of Jesus" in successive issues. Later writers use them together.

7. A narrative, developed like G from the original *Stammberecht*, but independently. Since it becomes the special source of Mark, it is called S (*Sonderquelle*). This is historically the most valuable narrative source. Unlike G, it has no dogmatic purpose; it is written, not to prove any thesis, but to relate the gospel story. It has much material lacking in G, is exceedingly vivid and dramatic in style, and gives Mark its air of genuineness and reality. It is without special Jewish-Christian interest, and originates in some Hellenistic society, in the later fifties. It has no connection with Peter; the famous statement of Papias is only a mistaken conjecture, without real relation either to Mark's Gospel or to S.

8. The Gospel of Mark. This edited the two older works (G with its additions Q<sup>1</sup> and Q<sup>2</sup>, and S) into one, with certain changes and editorial additions. The earlier unities were broken up, and passages from both sources were alternately used, causing frequent recapitulations and doublets. The work appears about the year 70; concerning the personality or residence of the author Haupt makes no comment.

9. A third addition to G (Q<sup>3</sup>), made by the Palestinian Christian group just after the destruction of Jerusalem. Here are some thirty-five passages of discourse, containing instruction for the community in the dark days when, separated from the mother synagogue, its name cast out as evil, it must gain courage and self-consciousness sufficient to face the world as an independent religious body. Q<sup>3</sup> is longer than either of the earlier Q passages which it supplements; it contains the bulk of the Sermon on the Mount, the temptation story, and much more that is now most prominent in our gospels. It is the product of the community, not historical reminiscence of what Jesus had said; the spirit at most is his bequest. The standpoint is universalistic, severely critical of the Pharisees and the Jewish leaders, recognizing the just judgment of God on blind and stubborn Israel. This Q<sup>3</sup> material is of course simply the Q material in Matthew and Luke which has no parallel in Mark, which was written just too early to make use of it.

10. Further narrative additions to G, after Mark used it, before Matthew and Luke used it. These include a Davidic genealogy (different in different copies of G), a story of virgin conception and birth (better kept in Matthew, Luke taking only the fact and giving new details), possibly also an account of the end of Judas (in Matthew and Acts). Matthew's copy of G had also other additions, notably in the passion and resurrection sections.

11. A third narrative document, used by Luke as a special source (L). A fairly complete narrative, based (like G and S) on the early *Stammbereich*, but continuing the story beyond the resurrection into the early apostolic days, so that it became a source also for Acts. Its material is much like that of S, quite unlike G, but it idealizes, has much devout and artless wonder, is plainly far removed from the historic basis of its narrative. The author is a Christian of Jewish origin but of universalistic attitude, for whom the early Jewish-Gentile controversy is long since forgotten. He always speaks of Jesus as "the Lord," and has many elements in common with the fourth evangelist (did "John" know L?); he may, therefore, write in Asia Minor, though his material is Judean. His date is approximately the year 80.

12. A series of further discourse-additions ( $Q^z = \text{Zusatz zur } Q$ ), made to the Q parts of the GQ document, as the material of 10 was added to the G part. As before, the copy used by Matthew did not receive just the same series of additions as the copy used by Luke. There are allusions to the fate of Jerusalem, more parables and illustrations, especially in Luke (unjust judge, importunate friend, rich fool, good Samaritan, Dives and Lazarus, unjust steward), but also in Matthew (judgment of the sheep and goats). Some additions are common to both, mainly suggestions which were differently worked up by the two evangelists (Luke 12:35 f. = Matthew's ten virgins; Luke's prodigal son = Matthew's two unlike sons; Luke's older brother of the prodigal son = Matthew's workers in the vineyard; Luke's two debtors [7:41-43] = Matthew's wicked servant [18:23-34]). The additions under this head are mainly marginal notes made in the Q MSS, treated by the evangelists with more freedom than the texts themselves. Date and place of this editing are not given.

13. A late strict Jewish-Christian (Nazarene) redaction of the exemplar of GQ which Matthew later used. There is a mild anti-Pauline polemic, like that in the Epistle of James, which occupies about the same point of view, which is perhaps that of the Jewish-Christian group in Jerusalem after its rebuilding, late in the century.

14. The Gospel of Luke. Written about the year 100, by an author who is certainly *not* Paul's friend Luke, the author of the "we-sections" in Acts, probably not a Gentile. He is more of a historian than any of his predecessors or than Matthew, uses a larger number of sources (including Josephus) than any, and uses them more critically, though he makes fewer alterations of language than does Matthew. Of Mark he makes far less use than of Mark's sources and of L. On the whole, the actual form of the sources can be found most truly in Luke (compare his quotation of "we-passages" in Acts).

15. The Gospel of Matthew. Written by a universalistic Jewish-Christian, later than Luke by a few years. Matthew is more theologian than historian, most concerned to produce out of his various materials an edifying religious unity. He is skilled in this kind of composition, and presents "the gospel" more successfully than Luke, as the experience of the church has always recognized.

[16. Luke's own contribution; additions and editorial changes in the interest of Ebionitism, asceticism, humility.]

[17. Matthew's own contribution; fourteen *Reflexionszitate* from the Old Testament, added material in the sections concerning birth, passion, and resurrection, certain comments referring to Peter (especially 16: 17-19), a few added parables, illustrations, and editorial remarks.]

Thus the writing of our gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke means the writing, not of three, or four, documents, but of fifteen. The hypothesis is possible, "since many undertook to draw up a narrative concerning these matters." The material for its testing lies in Haupt's detailed analysis. One thing is clear, as Haupt points out in his *Vorwort*, and often in the later discussion: we have here very few *Worte Jesu*, very much *Gemeindeüberlieferung*, or rather *Gemeindedichtung*. "After a glance at the source-situation, one would scarcely dare to feel sure of the exact authenticity of even a single word of Jesus." That phrase from the preface well expresses the feeling of the reader when he closes the book. If this is true, we wish to know it. If not Jesus, but some unknown man in Jerusalem in the year 71, conceived the great words of the Sermon on the Mount, if not Jesus, but the unknown third evangelist, conceived the supreme parable of the Prodigal Son, we wish to know it. The knowledge will not harm us; the material is still ours, with all its values. But the critical question still remains whether the material itself does not bear clear evidence of being the product of a single master-mind, rather than a collocation of utterances from a great variety of divergent minds, during seventy years, in many environments. With

all allowance for the obvious editing of the material, does not the great bulk of the material exist prior to the editing? If Haupt is right, the material is due to the editing, comes into being in the editorial process. The solution cannot be found by literary analysis alone.

But whether Haupt is right in his main thesis or no, he is wonderfully right in many particular observations, which are illuminating for the exegesis of particular passages. Nowhere have the peculiar characteristics of the evangelists Matthew and Luke been set forth with more understanding and insight than in the closing sections of this book. How felicitous is the characterization of Matthew in his own words (13:52) as the "scribe disciplined to the kingdom of God . . . bringing forth out of his treasure things new and old." The book shows thoroughness in scientific method, clear grasp of the material, appreciation of its values, insight into its meanings. It must be reckoned with in future studies of the synoptic problem.

There are rather more misprints than are common in German books, especially in the numerals referring to gospel verses. Accuracy here is peculiarly difficult, but also peculiarly necessary.

CLAYTON R. BOWEN

MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

---

### NEW RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE STUDIES ON CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

The three most important recent books bearing directly upon early Christianity and its relation to its contemporary religious world are Norden's *Agnostos Theos*,<sup>1</sup> Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*,<sup>2</sup> and J. Weiss's *Primitive Christianity*.<sup>3</sup> The first is written from the point of view of the student of literature and is concerned primarily with an investigation of forms of religious discourse current in the Greco-Roman world of New Testament times. The second work is composed from the standpoint of the New Testament scholar who makes free use of materials from the gentile environment of the new religion as a means of explaining the genesis and evolution of christological doctrine down to the end

<sup>1</sup> *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede.* Von Eduard Norden. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. ix+410 pages. M. 12.

<sup>2</sup> *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus.* Von Wilhelm Bousset. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. xxiv+474 pages. M. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Das Urchristentum.* Von Johannes Weiss. I. Teil: 1.-3. Buch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1914. iv+146 pages. M. 7.20.